arXiv:1405.3948v1 [math.CA] 15 May 2014

Additivity, subadditivity and linearity:
automatic continuity and quantifier weakening
by
N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski

To Charles Goldie on his 70th birthday.

Abstract. We study the interplay between additivity (as in the Cauchy functional equation), subadditivity and linearity. We obtain automatic continuity results in which additive or subadditive functions, under minimal regularity conditions, are continuous and so linear. We apply our results in the context of quantifier weakening in the theory of regular variation completing our programme of reducing the number of hard proofs there to zero.

Key words. Subadditive, sublinear, shift-compact, analytic spanning set, additive subgroup, Hamel basis, Steinhaus Sum Theorem.
Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): Primary 26A03; 39B62.

1 Introduction

Our main theme here is the interplay between additivity (as in the Cauchy functional equation), subadditivity and linearity. As is well known, in the presence of smoothness conditions (such as continuity), additive functions $A : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are linear, so of the form $A(x) = cx$. There is much scope for weakening the smoothness requirement and also much scope for weakening the universal quantifier by thinning its range $\mathbb{A}$ below from the classical context $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$:

$$A(u+v) = A(u) + A(v) \ (\forall u, v \in \mathbb{A}). \qquad (\mathrm{Add}_{\mathbb{A}})$$

We address the Cauchy functional equation in §2 below. Theorem 1, our quantifier weakening[1] theorem, was our original motivation, for reasons explained later in the paper. We pass in §3 to obtaining linearity from subadditivity (Theorem 2). In §4 we give a number of needed propositions on subadditivity. We give in §5 a strong quantifier weakening theorem extending Theorem 1 and encompassing classical results, such as Ostrowski's Theorem [BinO11]. In

[1] or 'quantifier easing'

§7 we extend Berz's Theorem on sublinearity [Ber] from the classical measurable case to the Baire category case, more natural for us here, since refining the Euclidean topology to the density topology (which converts measurable sets into *Baire* sets, i.e. sets with the Baire property – see e.g. [BinO10], [BinO16]; cf. §9.9) yields a parallel new proof of Berz's Theorem. In §6 we discuss spanning and thinning: we want to weaken quantifiers by thinning their range as much as possible. But limits are imposed on this: a set which is too thin will not be able to span. We are thinking here of the reals $\mathbb{R}$ as a vector space over the rationals $\mathbb{Q}$, Hamel bases etc. All this is motivated by regular variation, for which see §8. This makes good on the claim we have already made elsewhere (see [BinO7,8,11,12]): this reduces the number of hard proofs in theory of regular variation ([BinGT], henceforth BGT) to zero. We close in §9 with a number of complements.

Our results here concern, as well as quantifier weakening and automatic continuity, various results on additive, subadditive and sublinear functions. Our original motivation was (quantifier weakening in the context of) regular variation (§8: Karamata theory and its extensions; see e.g. BGT). This specific motivation turns out to be valuable here: our viewpoint on the area, informed by this, is complementary to (indeed, contrasts with) that of the standard work in the area, Kuczma ([Kuc, Ch. 16]); see §8.

This paper is a sequel to both [BinO11] (on the theorems of Steinhaus and Ostrowski, which underpin everything in this area) and [BinO14] (on the Goldie functional equation and inequality) ; we refer to these sources for background.

A classical situation where quantifier weakening is important (which, as it happened, was the original motivation for [BinG, I,II.6], and so for this paper and [BinO11] via BGT) is the theory of *Frullani integrals* ([BinG, II §6], BGT §1.6.4; Berndt [Bern]), important in many areas of analysis and probability. This in turn is a combination of two results from regular variation, the Aljančić-Karamata theorem (a result of Mercerian type) and the Characterisation Theorem (BGT §1.4), a central result in the area inseparable from quantifier weakening. One reason why regular variation is so ubiquitous and useful is its relevance to *scaling* [Bin].

2 Cauchy theory

We state here Theorem 1 (to be proved below, where further results of this kind are established) – concerned with *weakening* the quantifier in the classical Cauchy functional equation, by thinning the range $\mathbb{A}$ of the universal quantifier in $(\mathrm{Add}_{\mathbb{A}})$ above from the classical context $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$. The philosophy behind the theorems is to establish linearity of a function F on $\mathbb{R}$ from its additivity on a thinner set $\mathbb{A}$ and from additional conditions, which include its extendability to a subadditive function; recall that $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is *subadditive* [HilP, Ch. 3] if

$$S(u+v) \leqslant S(u) + S(v). \tag{Sub}$$

(This choice for the setting below is more convenient than alternatively working on $\mathbb{R}_+$.) The principal motivation for such an approach arises in regular variation (for which see §8) and rests on the following result, which identifies the *additive kernel* G of the function F^* below. The paper studies conditions under which F^* coincides with this kernel.

Proposition 1 (Additive Kernel). *For $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ put*

$$\mathbb{A}_F := \{u : \lim_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)] \text{ exists and is finite}\},$$

and, for $a \in \mathbb{A}_F$, put $G(a) := \lim_{x\to\infty}[F(a+x) - F(x)]$. For $u \in \mathbb{R}$ define

$$F^*(u) := \limsup_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)].$$

Then:
(i) *$\mathbb{A}_F$ is an additive subgroup;*
(ii) *G is an additive function on $\mathbb{A}_F$;*
(iii) *$F^* : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is a subadditive extension of G;*
(iv) *F^* is finite-valued and additive iff $\mathbb{A}_F = \mathbb{R}$ and $F^*(u) = G(u)$ for all u.*

Proof. (i) $0 \in \mathbb{A}_F$. From

$$F(u+v+x) - F(x) = [F(u+v+x) - F(v+x)] + [F(v+x) - F(x)], \quad (*)$$

we see that $\mathbb{A}_F$ is a subsemigroup of $\mathbb{R}$. In fact it is a subgroup: for $u \in \mathbb{A}_F$ one has $-u \in \mathbb{A}_F$, because on writing $y = u + x$ one has

$$F(-u+y) - F(y) = -[F(u+x) - F(x)]. \ \square \text{ (i)}$$

(iii) The identity (*) also implies subadditivity of F^* and the partial additivity result that

$$F^*(u+v) = F^*(u) + F^*(v) \ \forall u \in \mathbb{A}_F \ \forall v \in \mathbb{R}. \qquad (**)$$

We note that for $u \in \mathbb{A}_F$, i.e. when $G(u)$ exists, then $F^*(u) = G(u)$, so proving part (iii) for $u \in \mathbb{A}_F$. $\square$ (iii)
(ii) With $v \in \mathbb{A}_F$, (**) above yields additivity of G. $\square$ (ii)
(iv) If F^* is finite-valued and additive, then $F^*(-u) = -F^*(u)$ for all u. The substitution $y = u + x$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)] &= -\limsup_{x\to\infty}[F(x) - F(u+x)] \\ &= -\limsup_{y\to\infty}[F(-u+y) - F(y)] \\ &= -F^*(-u) = F^*(u). \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\liminf_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)] = \limsup_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)]$, i.e. $F^*(u) = \lim_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)]$ for all u; so $\mathbb{A}_F = \mathbb{R}$. The converse follows from (i) and (ii). $\square$

Remark. With the Axiom of Choice AC replaced by an axiom (such as the Axiom of Determinacy, AD) under which all sets are Baire/measurable (a price that most mathematicians most of the time will not be willing to pay!), Prop. 1 (helped by Prop. 6 below) is all we need, and the remaining results below become unnecessary. See §9.2 for amplification.

Theorem 1. *For $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ subadditive, and $\mathbb{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ an additive subgroup, suppose that*
(i) $\mathbb{A}$ *is dense;*
(ii) $A := S|\mathbb{A}$ *is finite and additive, i.e.* ($\mathrm{Add}_{\mathbb{A}}$) *holds*;
(iii) S *satisfies the one-sided boundedness condition*

$$\limsup_{u\downarrow 0} S(u) \leqslant 0. \qquad (\limsup)$$

Then $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$ and S is linear: $S(u) = cu$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

For the proof, see the end of §3. Its specialization to S finite-valued and additive, with $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$, captures the classical results of Darboux, Ostrowski and Mehdi (see §5) via the following. Below we use *negligible* to mean meagre or null, according as (Baire) category or (Lebesgue) measure is considered.

Proposition 2. *For $A : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ additive, the following are equivalent:*
(i) *A is bounded above on a non-negligible Baire/measurable set;*
(ii) *A is bounded above on an interval;*
(iii) *for some $M \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\limsup_{u \downarrow 0} A(u) \leqslant M; \qquad (\limsup_M)$$

(iv) $(\limsup)_0$ *holds, i.e.* $(\limsup)$ *holds;*
(v) *A is linear: $A(u) = cu$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. (i)→(ii): If A is bounded above on a non-negligible Baire/measurable set L, then it is bounded above on $L + L$, which by the Steinhaus-Piccard-Pettis Sum-Theorem ([BinO9, Th. E]; cf. [BinO11]) contains an interval.
(ii)→(iii): By additivity, $(\limsup)_M$ holds for some $M \in \mathbb{R}$.
(iii)→(iv): W.l.o.g. $M \geqslant 0$. For any $K > M$, if $\sup\{A(u) : 0 < u < \delta\} < K$, then by additivity $\sup\{A(u) : 0 < u < \delta/2\} < K/2$, as $2A(u) = A(2u) < K$, so $(\limsup)_{M/2}$ holds, and so the least $M \geqslant 0$ for which the condition holds is $M = 0$.
(iv)→(v): Apply Theorem 1 to $S = A$ with $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$.
(v)→(i): Clear. □

More, however, is true. See Theorem $1'$ in §5, which weakens the hypothesis (iii) of Theorem 1 so much that the Darboux-Ostrowski-Mehdi Theorem is its immediate corollary. See also Theorem 3 (§6), in which we weaken the density hypothesis (i) of Theorem 1 in the language of *spanning* and *thinning*.

3 Linearity from subadditivity

Here we establish a paradigm for identifying circumstances *when linearity may be deduced from subadditivity* – encapsulated in Theorem 2 below – by showing that $S(y)/S(x) = y/x$ on a dense subspace and appealing to right-continuity. This is the nub of Theorem 1, proved below. We begin with a key step.

Proposition 3 (cf. Generalized Goldie Theorem [BinO14, Th. 3]). *If, for some dense additive subgroup $\mathbb{A}$ of $\mathbb{R}$, the function $G : \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ is additive and right-continuous at 0, then G is linear on $\mathbb{A}$: $G(u) = cu$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $u \in \mathbb{A}$.*

Proof. The proof is adapted from BGT Th. 3.2.5 (see also [BinG, Proof of Th. 5.7]). Fix any positive $u_0 \in \mathbb{A}$ and put $c := G(u_0)/u_0$. We show that $G(u) = cu$ for all $u \in \mathbb{A}$. To this end, fix any $u \in \mathbb{A}$. Now define for $0 < \delta \in \mathbb{A}$

$$i = i(\delta) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n\delta > u\},\ i_0 = i_0(\delta) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n\delta > u_0\},$$

so that $i(\delta)\delta \downarrow u$ and $i_0(\delta)\delta \downarrow u_0$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$; here without loss of generality $G(\delta) \neq 0$ (otherwise $G = 0$ on $(0, \varepsilon) \cap \mathbb{A}$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, implying below that $G(u) = 0$ and so $G \equiv 0$).

Since $\delta, u_0 \in \mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{A}$ is a subgroup, we have by additivity of G that $G(i\delta) = iG(\delta)$; likewise $G(i_0\delta) = i_0 G(\delta)$. Taking limits through $\mathbb{A}$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$ and using right-continuity of G at u_0 and u,

$$G(u_0) = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} G(i_0(\delta)\delta),\ G(u) = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} G(i(\delta)\delta).$$

Dividing these two, as $u_0 \neq 0$,

$$G(u)/G(u_0) = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} i(\delta)G(\delta)/i_0(\delta)G(\delta) = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} i(\delta)/i_0(\delta) = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} i(\delta)\delta/i_0(\delta)\delta = u/u_0.$$

Cross-multiplying, $G(u) = cu$ for any $u \in \mathbb{A}$. □

Proposition 4 (Automatic continuity, after Darboux, [Dar]**).** *For $\mathbb{A}$ an additive subgroup and $A : \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ additive, the following are equivalent:*
(i) *A is linear*;
(ii) *A is right-continuous at* 0;
(iii) *A is continuous at* 0;
(iv) *A is locally bounded.*

Proof. As this is routine, we include only a proof of (iv)→(i), thematic here, referring to [BinO11] for details. As A is locally bounded at 0, there is $\delta > 0$ and M such that $|A(a)| \leqslant M$ for $a \in \mathbb{A}$ with $|a| < \delta$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose an integer N with $N > M/\varepsilon$. For $a \in \mathbb{A}$ with $|a| < \delta/N$, $|NA(a)| = |A(Na)| \leqslant M$, so

$$|A(a)| \leqslant \varepsilon,$$

as $M/N < \varepsilon$. This gives continuity, and linearity follows from Prop. 3. □

Proposition 5 (Unique extension). *For $\Sigma \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ dense and closed under integer scaling (e.g. a subgroup), let $G : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ be linear: $G(\sigma) = c\sigma$. If*

$S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *with* $S(0+) = 0$ *is any subadditive extension of* G*, then* S *is also linear on* $\mathbb{R}$ *and* $S(u) = cu$ *for all* $u \in \mathbb{R}$*.*

Proof. By subadditivity, if $S(v_n) \to 0$ for $v_n \downarrow 0$, then for any u

$$S(u + v_n) \leqslant S(u) + S(v_n) \to S(u),$$

as $S(0+) = 0$. So

$$\limsup_{v \downarrow 0} S(u + v) \leqslant S(u)$$

for all u. In the notation of Prop. 3 above: fix u and take $v_\delta := i(\delta)\delta - u > 0$ with $\delta \in \Sigma$ tending to 0, so that $v_\delta \downarrow 0$. Since $i(\delta)\delta \in \Sigma$, and so $G(i(\delta)\delta) = ci(\delta)\delta$,

$$S(u) \geqslant \limsup_{v \downarrow 0} S(u + v) \geqslant \limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} S(u + v_\delta) \geqslant \limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} G(i(\delta)\delta) = cu.$$

Taking $v \in \Sigma$ with $v < u$, appealing to subadditivity of S, and $S(v) = G(v) = cv$,

$$cu \leqslant S(u) \leqslant S(v) + S(u - v) = cv + S(u - v).$$

But $S(0+) = 0$, so taking limits as $u - v \downarrow 0$ gives

$$cu \leqslant S(u) \leqslant cu : \ S(u) = cu. \ \square$$

As a corollary of Prop. 3 and 4 we have:

Theorem 2 (On linearity). *Let* $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *be subadditive with* $S(0+) = 0$*. If, for some dense additive subgroup* $\mathbb{A}$ *of* $\mathbb{R}$*, the restriction* $S|\mathbb{A}$ *is additive and right-continuous, then* S *is linear on* $\mathbb{R}$*:* $S(u) = cu$ *for some* $c \in \mathbb{R}$ *and all* $u \in \mathbb{R}$*.*

Proof. S extends $G := S|\mathbb{A}$, additive and continuous by Prop. 4. $\square$

Cautionary Example. $S := \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}$ is subadditive, and for $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{Q}$, $S|\mathbb{A} = 0$ is linear; but S is not linear. We return to the relation of this example to Theorem 2 later in §8.

Proposition 6 (On finiteness). *If* $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ *is subadditive and* (i) $|S| < \infty$ *on a subset* Σ *unbounded below (e.g. a dense subset of* $\mathbb{R}$*);*

(ii) *S satisfies the condition* ($\limsup$)
– *then S is finite everywhere.*

Proof. By (ii), for some $\delta > 0$, $S(x) < \infty$ for $x \in (0, \delta]$, so by subadditivity $S(u) < \infty$ for all $u > 0$. (Take $u = n\delta + \eta$ with $0 \leqslant \eta < \delta$; for $\eta > 0$ we have $S(u) \leqslant nS(\delta) + S(\eta)$, and otherwise $S(u) \leqslant nS(\delta)$.) For $u < 0$, choose $v_0 \in \Sigma$ with $v_0 < u$; then

$$S(u) \leqslant S(u - v_0) + S(v_0) < \infty,$$

as $u - v_0 > 0$ and $S(v_0)$ is finite. Combining, $S(u) < \infty$ for all u. Now for any u and any $v \in (\Sigma - u)$,

$$-S(u) \leqslant S(v) - S(u + v) < \infty,$$

as $S(v) < \infty$ and $u + v \in \Sigma$. So $S(u) > -\infty$. □

Proposition 7. *Suppose $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is subadditive. Then:*
(i) *If S satisfies* ($\limsup$)*, then it is bounded above locally.*
(ii) *If S is bounded above locally, then it is locally bounded.*
(iii) *If S is locally bounded, then* $\liminf_{t \to 0} S(t) \geqslant 0$.

Proof. (i) Suppose otherwise. Then for some $u_n \to u$ the sequence $S(u_n)$ is unbounded. W. l. o. g. $S(u_n) \geqslant n$. Now $z_n := u_n - u \to 0$. By $(\limsup)_0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that $S(x) < 1$ for $0 < x < \delta$. But for all large enough m, say $m > M$, one has $0 < z_m < \delta$. Then for all $m > M$

$$m \leqslant S(u + z_m) \leqslant S(u) + S(z_m) < 1 + S(u),$$

a contradiction.
(ii) (Compare [Kuc, Th. 16.2.2]). Proceed similarly, and suppose now that there is $u_n \to u$ with $S(u_n) \leqslant -n$ and that S is bounded above on an interval I by K. W. l. o. g. $t - u_n \in I$ for some t and all n. (e.g. by the Kestelman-Borwein-Ditor Theorem ([BinO11, Th. 4.2], KBD below). By subadditivity, $S(t) \leqslant S(t - u_n) + S(u_n) \leqslant K + S(u_n)$, and so

$$n \leqslant -S(u_n) \leqslant K - S(t),$$

a contradiction.

(iii) Following [HilP, 7.4.3], select $z_n \to 0$ with $f(z_n) \to \lambda_- := \inf_{u \to 0} S(u)$. By local boundedness, λ_- is finite, so for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and n large enough $\lambda_- - \varepsilon \leqslant f(2z_n) \leqslant 2f(z_n) < 2(\lambda_- + \varepsilon)$. So $\lambda_- \leqslant 2\lambda_-$, yielding $\lambda_- \geqslant 0$. □

Proposition 8 (Automatic right-continuity – cf. [HilP, Th. 7.4.3, 7.8.2]**).** *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is subadditive and satisfies* (lim sup) *with $S(0) = 0$, then $S(0+) = 0$.*

Proof. For $n = 1, 2, ...$ consider $v_n \downarrow 0$ with $S(v_n) \to a \neq 0$; then $S(v_n) \to a \in [-\infty, 0)$. (Indeed, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that $S(x) \leqslant \varepsilon$ for all $x \in (0, \delta)$.) W. l. o. g., $w := \sum_i v_i < \infty$. Put $w_n := \sum_{i \leqslant n} v_i \to w$. By subadditivity,

$$S(w_n) \leqslant \sum_{i \leqslant n} S(v_i) \to L = -\infty.$$

This contradicts local boundedness at w (by Prop. 7). So $a = 0 = S(0+)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1. In view of $(\limsup)_0$, by Prop. 6 S is finite; by Prop. 7 and 8 it is right-continuous at 0. As $\mathbb{A}_F$ is a subgroup and $A = S|\mathbb{A}$ is additive, apply Theorem 3 to S. □

4 Subadditive functions

We turn now from functional equations (whose prototype for us is the Cauchy functional equation (Add) from §1) to functional inequalities (the prototype of which for us is the corresponding inequality (Sub) from §2). The classical sources here are [HilP, Ch. 3] (for the measurable case only, but we need the category version also, for which see [BinO1]) and [Kuc, Ch. 16]. Kuczma makes the contrast between the surprisingly great affinity between Cauchy's equation and Jensen's inequality, and the differences between (Add) and (Sub). Here matters are reversed: what is surprising in our context is the *similarity* between (Add) and (Sub).

Definitions. 1. Say that $(B)\text{-}\limsup_{u \downarrow 0} S(u) \leqslant M \in \mathbb{R}$ or $(L)\text{-}\limsup_{u \downarrow 0} S(u) \leqslant M \in \mathbb{R}$ if respectively there is a sequence of non-negligible sets $P_n \subseteq (0, 1/n)$ that are *Baire* (i.e. have the Baire property), or (Lebesgue) *measurable* with (using 'BL' for 'Baire or Lebesgue')

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} S[P_n] := \limsup_{n \to \infty} \{S(x) : x \in P_n\} \leqslant M. \qquad (BL\text{-}\limsup_M(S))$$

Above, if BL-$\limsup_M(S)$ holds with $P_n = (0, 1/n)$, we will write BL-$\limsup_M$, omitting reference to the function S if context permits; in particular,

$$BL\text{-}\limsup_M \Longrightarrow \limsup_0 .$$

2. Denoting level sets of S by

$$H^r, \text{ or } H^r(S) := \{x : |S(x)| < r\},$$

and following [BinO1], say $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is **WNT** *on* Σ (and $S : \mathbb{R} \to [-\infty, +\infty]$ is **WNT*** on Σ) if for each convergent sequence u_n there is $t \in \Sigma$, an infinite $\mathbb{M} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\{t + u_m : m \in \mathbb{M}\} \subseteq H^k \cap \Sigma.$$

When $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}$ we abbreviate this to **WNT**.
(The **WNT*** case when $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}$, most relevant to Theorem 1, differs here from the definition adopted in [BinO1] in the case when infinite values arise.) So

$$BL\text{-}\limsup_M \Longrightarrow \mathbf{WNT}.$$

3. Say that a set Σ is *shift-compact* if for each null sequence z_n ($z_n \to 0$) there is $t \in \Sigma$, an infinite $\mathbb{M} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\{t + z_m : m \in \mathbb{M}\} \subseteq \Sigma,$$

– see [BinO11] and for the group-action aspects [MilO] (in earlier work the term *generically subuniversal* was used, in recognition of Kestelman's pioneering work). Say that

$$(SS)\text{-}\limsup_{u\to 0} S(u) \leqslant M \in \mathbb{R}$$

if there is a sequence of symmetric shift-compact sets $Q_n \subseteq (-1/n, 1/n)$ with

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} S[Q_n] \leqslant M. \qquad (SS\text{-}\limsup_M)$$

This is a *two-sided* domain condition (cf. §9.8); taking $Q_n := P_n \cup -P_n$, we have

$$SS\text{-}\limsup_M \Longrightarrow BL\text{-}\limsup_M .$$

Proposition 9. (i) *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is subadditive and satisfies (BL-$\limsup_M$) for some $M \in \mathbb{R}$, then S is **WNT**. In fact*

$$BL\text{-}\limsup_M \Longrightarrow \mathbf{WNT}, \text{ and } SS\text{-}\limsup_M \Longrightarrow \mathbf{WNT}.$$

(ii) *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Baire/measurable, then S is **WNT** on any non-negligible Baire/measurable set.*

Proof. (i) There is a non-negligible Baire/measurable set P with $S|P < K$. Given $u_n \to u$, put $z_n := u_n - u \to 0$; by KBD, choose $t \in P$ and $\mathbb{M}$ infinite with $\{t + z_m, t - z_m : m \in \mathbb{M}\} \subseteq P$. So

$$S(t + u_m) = S(u + t + z_m) < S(u) + K \text{ and } S(2t) - S(-u) - K < S(t + u_m),$$

the latter since

$$S(2t) = S(t+u_m+t-u_m) < S(t+u_m)+S(t-z_m)+S(-u) < S(t+u_m)+K+S(-u).$$

So for some k one has $\{t + u_m : m \in \mathbb{M}\} \subseteq H^k$. If ($SS$-$\limsup_M$) holds, then P above is merely taken shift-compact.
(ii) This is proved similarly, by noting that $\mathbb{R} = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} H^k$, as in [BinO3]. □

Proposition 6′ (On finiteness). *Suppose that $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is subadditive and satisfies:*
(i) *$|S| < \infty$ on a subset Σ unbounded below (e.g. a dense subset of $\mathbb{R}$), and*
(ii) *(BL-$\limsup)_M$ for some $M \in \mathbb{R}$.*
Then S is finite everywhere. In particular this is so if S is Baire/measurable.

Proof. Put $\Sigma_+ := \{x : S(x) < \infty\}$; this is a semigroup.

By assumption, for some $\delta > 0$, there is a non-negligible Baire/measurable subset of $(0, \delta)$ on which S is bounded above. So Σ_+ contains an interval $[a, \infty)$ (see e.g. BGT Cor. 1.1.5). For $u < a$ choose $v_0 \in \Sigma$ with $v_0 < u - a$. Then

$$S(u) \leqslant S(u - v_0) + S(v_0) < \infty,$$

as $u - v_0 > a$ and $S(v_0)$ is finite. Combining, $S(u) < \infty$ for all u. Now for any u and any $v \in (\Sigma - u)$,

$$-S(u) \leqslant S(v) - S(u + v) < \infty,$$

as $u + v \in \Sigma$. So $S(u) > -\infty$. □

Proposition 7′. *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is subadditive and **WNT**, then it is locally bounded above.*

Proof ([BinO1, Prop. 2], included here for completeness). If not, for some $u_n \to u$, the sequence $S(u_n)$ is unbounded above. Now $z_n := u_n - u \to 0$. By

WNT for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and infinite $\mathbb{M}$, one has $t + z_m \in H^k$. Then for $m \in \mathbb{M}$

$$S(u_m) = S(u + z_m) \leqslant S(u - t) + S(t + z_m) \leqslant S(u - t) + k,$$

contradicting unboundedness above. □

Proposition 10. *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is subadditive with $S(0) = 0$ and:*
(i) *S is continuous and* **WNT** *on some symmetric set Σ containing 0;*
(ii) *for each $\delta > 0$, S is shift compact on $\Sigma \cap (0, \delta)$*
– *then S is continuous at 0 and so everywhere.*

In particular, this is so if there is a symmetric set Σ on which

$$S(u) = c_{\pm}u \text{ for some } c_{\pm} \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and all } u \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cap \Sigma, \text{ or all } u \in \mathbb{R}_- \cap \Sigma \text{ resp.};$$

and Σ is Baire/measurable, non-negligible in each $(0, \delta)$ for $\delta > 0$.

Proof. If S is not continuous at 0, then by Prop 7′ and Prop. 7(iii) $\lambda_+ := \limsup_{t\to 0} S(t) > \liminf_{t\to 0} S(t) \geqslant 0$. Choose $z_n \to 0$ with $S(z_n) \to \lambda_+ > 0$. Let $\varepsilon = \lambda_+/3$. By continuity at 0 there is $\delta > 0$ with $|S(t)| < \varepsilon$ for $t \in S \cap (-\delta, \delta)$. By shift-compactness on $\Sigma \cap (0, \delta)$, there are $t \in \Sigma$ and an infinite $\mathbb{M}$ such that $t + z_m \in \Sigma$ for $m \in \mathbb{M}$. Then by subadditivity

$$S(z_m) \leqslant S(t + z_m) + S(-t).$$

So taking limits through $\mathbb{M}$, by continuity on Σ,

$$\lambda_+ \leqslant S(t) + S(-t) \leqslant 2\varepsilon < \lambda_+,$$

as $-t \in \Sigma$. But this is a contradiction. So S is continuous at 0. As in [HilP, Th. 2.5.2], continuity at all points follows by noting that

$$S(x) - S(-h) \leqslant S(x + h) \leqslant S(x) + S(h).$$

The remaining assertion follows from Prop. 9(ii). □

Remark. In Prop. 10 above, it is not enough to assume only that $S \in$**WNT** and S is $\mathbb{Q}$-homogeneous on a dense set Σ (i.e. $S(q\sigma) = qS(\sigma)$ *for all* $\sigma \in \Sigma$ *and rational* q); indeed, the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}$ is subadditive and also $\mathbb{Q}$-homogeneous on $\Sigma = \mathbb{Q}$, but not continuous. Such a weaker assumption yields only that $\liminf_{t\to 0} S(t) = 0 = S(0)$. (Proof: As S is locally bounded,

choose K and $\delta > 0$ with $|S| < K$ on $[-\delta, \delta]$. Fix $\sigma \in \Sigma \cap (0, \delta)$; then $|S(\sigma/n)| = |S(\sigma)|/n \leqslant K/n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.)

Proposition 8′. *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is subadditive with $S(0) = 0$ and satisfies $(SS\text{-}\limsup)_0$, then $S(0+) = S(0)$.*

Proof. Otherwise, as above, $\lambda_+ := \limsup_{t \to 0} S(t) > \liminf_{t \to 0} S(t) \geqslant 0$, the latter by Props. 9(i), 7′ and 7. Choose $z_n \to 0$ with $S(z_n) \to \lambda_+ > 0$, and Q_n as in $(SS\text{-}\limsup)_0$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, take $N = N(\varepsilon)$ such that $\sup S(Q_N) < \varepsilon/2$. As Q_N is shift-compact, we may choose $t \in Q_N$ and an infinite $\mathbb{M}$ such that $t + z_m \in Q_N$ for $m \in \mathbb{M}$. Then for $m \in \mathbb{M}$

$$S(z_m) \leqslant S(t + z_m) + S(-t) < \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 \leqslant \varepsilon,$$

as $-t \in Q_N$ (symmetry). Taking limits through $\mathbb{M}$ yields $\lambda_+ \leqslant \varepsilon$. But ε was arbitrary, so $\lambda_+ \leqslant 0$, a contradiction. So $\lambda_+ = 0$, and in particular, $S(0+) = 0$. □

5 Strong Quantifier-Weakening Theorem

We begin with the following combinatorial version of the Steinhaus Subgroup Theorem, Theorem S below, which it will be seen bears the burden of the proof of our stronger version of Theorem 1, Theorem 1′ below. See [BinO11] for further equivalences in Theorem S (e.g. that S has finite index in $\mathbb{R}$, and statements involving Ramsey theory).

Theorem S ([BinO11, Th. 6.2]) *For an additive subgroup $\mathbb{A}$ of $\mathbb{R}$, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$,
(ii) $\mathbb{A}$ *contains a non-negligible Baire/measurable set,*
(iii) $\mathbb{A}$ *is shift-compact.*

Theorem 1′. *With S and $\mathbb{A}$ as in Theorem 1 above, suppose that*
(i) $\mathbb{A}$ *is dense;*
(ii) $S|\mathbb{A}$ *is finite and additive, i.e.* $(\mathrm{Add}_{\mathbb{A}})$,
(iii) S *is* ***WNT**** *on* $\mathbb{A}$, *e.g. S satisfies $(SS\text{-}\limsup)_0$ or $(BL\text{-}\limsup)_0$.*
Then $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$ and S is linear: $S(u) = cu$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. As before, S is subadditive, and by assumption is finite on the dense (additive) subgroup $\mathbb{A}$ of $\mathbb{R}$. As S is $\mathbf{WNT}^*$ on $\mathbb{A}$, $\mathbb{A}$ is shift-compact. (Indeed,

if $z_n \to 0$, then there are $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and infinite $\mathbb{M}$ such that t and $t + z_m \in H^k(S) \cap \mathbb{A}$.) By Theorem S above, $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$, i.e. S is finite everywhere. By assumption, S is additive on the subgroup $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$. As S is locally bounded by **WNT*** (or Prop. 8′, if assuming $(SS\text{-}\limsup)_0$), S is right-continuous at all points of $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$. Now use Theorem 2. □

Theorem 1′ implies Th. 1, by Prop. 9(i) and since $\limsup_0 \implies BL\text{-}\limsup_M$ (§4).

Corollary (Darboux-Ostrowski-Mehdi Theorem; [Dar], [Ostr], [Meh]; cf. [BinO11])**.** *If A is additive and bounded above on a non-negligible set, then A is linear.*

Proof. As $S := A$ is additive, by Prop. 9(i) S is **WNT*** on $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{R}$. □

The measure-theoretic development here came earlier chronologically; it was then noticed that the Baire (or category) case was closely analogous. The two cases are developed in parallel in BGT. It has emerged recently that the primary case is in fact the category case; see e.g. [BinO2], [BinO10], [Ost2].

6 Spanning and thinning

Weakening of quantifiers amounts to *thinning* of the relevant set. Theorem 1 may be viewed as a two-pronged test of the subadditive function S on thin sets: one prong a domain condition, density, the other a boundedness (or as we see in §9.8, oscillation) condition at 0. As $\mathbb{A}$ is a subgroup, the first condition reduces to density of $\mathbb{A}$ at 0. On $\mathbb{R}$ it further reduces to a two-point condition: for Theorem 1 to hold, the set $\mathbb{A}$ necessarily has at least two incommensurable members; by Kronecker's Theorem ([HarW] XXIII, Th. 438) $\mathbb{A}$ is then dense. That is, $\mathbb{A}$ needs to be at least a two-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}$ (regarded as a vector space over $\mathbb{Q}$).

Say that $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a *spanning* set if it spans $\mathbb{R}$ regarded as a vector space over $\mathbb{Q}$ (e.g. contains a Hamel basis). We work below with *analytic sets*; for background see e.g. [Rog], [BinO6]. The approach below is motivated by a theorem due to F. Burton Jones and its later strengthening by Z. Kominek – see below. Say that T is (centrally) *symmetric* if $-T := \{-t : t \in T\} = T$, and that T is *shift-symmetric* if for some τ the set $T + \tau := \{t + \tau : t \in T\}$ is symmetric.

The vectorial view brings further insights. F. B. Jones [Jon] proved that for additive $A : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, if $A|T$ is continuous on an analytic spanning set T, then it is continuous. Much later, Kominek [Kom] showed that, for such a set T, if $A|T$ is bounded above on T, then T is continuous – cf. [BinO6, Th. JK]. Kominek's Theorem is stronger: it implies Jones', for which see again [BinO6, §3]. The Jones-Kominek results show how to test on thin sets T properties of interest on $\mathbb{R}$.

In Theorem $1'$ above the oscillation condition is further thinned by using only shift-compact subsets in neighbourhoods of the origin. This raises the question of establishing further quantifier weakening by testing only on analytic spanning sets, as these need not be shift-compact. This is indeed possible on both prongs, as follows.

As we have seen, Theorem 1 rests on the presence of enough of the following three properties: finiteness, local boundedness and continuity. These are aided by density, and easy to achieve for additive functions by demanding them on a spanning set. Kominek's Theorem cannot be applied directly to S, as S is only subadditive, but a simple modification of its proof will work below. It is convenient to refer to a result of Erdős, for which we need the following.

Definition. For H a Hamel basis, and by extension for H a spanning set, we write

$$Z(H) := \{k_1 h_1 + ... + k_n h_n : k_i \in \mathbb{Z}, h_i \in H\}$$

for the *Erdős set* of H (for which see e.g. [Kuc, §11.5]).

Theorem E (Erdős**;** see e.g. [Kuc, Lemma 11.5.4]**).** *For H a Hamel basis, the Erdős set $Z(H)$ is a dense subgroup.*

We need a modified version of the Analytic Dichotomy Lemma in [BinO6, §2], which refers to the *k-fold sum* $k \cdot T := T + ... + T$ (k times).

Proposition 11. *If T is a symmetric analytic spanning set, then for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the k-fold sum $k \cdot T$ contains the interval $(-1, 1)$.*

Proof. We indicate the necessary modification to the proof in [BinO6, §2]. As there, for some m-tuple of rationals $r_i = p_i/N$ with $p_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, the set $(r_1 T + ... + r_m T)$ is non-null. So too is $(p_1 T + ... + p_m T)$, and so $(p_1 T + ... + p_m T) - (p_1 T + ... + p_m T)$ contains an interval around 0 (by Steinhaus'

Sum Theorem; see. e.g. [BinO11, Theorem S]). As $T = -T$ we conclude that $T' := |p_1|T + ... + |p_m|T + |p_1|T + ... + |p_m|T$ contains an interval around 0, say $(-1/n, 1/n)$. Since $n \cdot T' \supseteq (-1, 1)$, one has $k \cdot T \supseteq (-1, 1)$ for $k = 2n(|p_1| + ... + |p_m|)$. □

We may now give the analytic spanning version of Theorem 1.

Theorem 3. *For $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ subadditive, and $\mathbb{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ an additive subgroup, suppose that*
(i) *$S|\mathbb{A}$ is finite and additive;*
(ii) *there exists a shift-symmetric, analytic, spanning set $T \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ such that $S|T$ is locally bounded above.*
Then S is linear: $S(u) = cu$, for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. By Prop. 11, fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \cdot T$ contains $(-1, 1)$. By the Erdős result above, the Erdős set $Z(T)$, and so also $\mathbb{A}$, is a dense subgroup. Now $k \cdot T \subseteq \mathbb{A}$, as $\mathbb{A}$ is a subgroup. As $k \cdot T$ contains an interval, $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$, by Theorem S above. As $S|T$ is locally bounded above, by subadditivity S is locally bounded above on $k \cdot T$, (by continuity of addition) and so on an interval. But S is additive on $\mathbb{R}$ and bounded above on an interval, so locally bounded, by Prop. 7(ii). So S is linear by Prop. 4. □

Remarks. 1. An interesting question is: can 'symmetric' be omitted in Theorem 3?
2. With C the standard Cantor set, consider its translate $T := C - \frac{1}{2}$, which is symmetric. As $C + C = [0, 2]$, $T + T = [-1, 1]$, as in Proposition 11. So, assuming the Axiom of Choice AC, a Hamel basis H may be selected in T and H is non-dense as C and T are. So a (nowhere dense) shift-symmetric Cantor set, such as T, would suffice to test for local boundedness. Though density is not explicitly mentioned, it remains present implicitly as T, being uncountable, contains incommensurables.
3. In view of the Jones-Kominek theorems above, the question arises as to whether a subadditive S with $S|T$ right-continuous on an analytic spanning set T is right-continuous on a dense set. Note that $S := \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}$ is continuous on the (analytic) spanning set $T := \mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}$, yet S is not continuous.

A continuous function $f : T \to \mathbb{R}$ is termed *extensibly continuous* or just *precompact* in [BinO6,§5] if $\{f(t_n)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence, whenever $\{t_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in T. For $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ additive, precompactness of $f|T$ on an

analytic spanning set T implies continuity, but this feature does not extend to subadditive functions, as $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}|(\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q})$ is precompact.

Definition. Altering the property $(BL\text{-}\limsup)_0$ so that the limsup is taken with reference to symmetric sets $P_n \subseteq (-1/n, 1/n)$ of the form $P_n := T/n = \{t/n : t \in T\}$, with T a fixed *symmetric* analytic spanning set in $(-1, 1)$, yields $JK(T)_0$ – the $(JK)_0$ *property for* T.

This yields an analogue of Theorem 3 for general subadditive functions S rather than those that are linear on an additive subgroup $\mathbb{A}$ containing an analytic spanning set T with $S|T$ bounded; this is inspired by Prop. 8 of §3. As each P_n is a spanning set, the semigroup argument underpinning Prop. $6'$ remains valid, and so Prop. $6'$ holds with $(JK)_0$ replacing $(BL\text{-}\limsup)_0$.

Theorem 4 (Automatic right-continuity, after Jones-Kominek). *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $S(0) = 0$ is subadditive and $JK(T)_0$ holds for some symmetric analytic spanning set T with $S|T$ is locally bounded above – then $S(0+) = 0$.*

Proof. By the Compact Spanning Approximation Theorem of [BinO6, §3], passing to a symmetric compact subset of T if necessary, we may assume that T is compact, and, rescaling if necessary, that $T \subseteq (-1, 1)$. By Prop. 11, fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \cdot T$ contains $(-1, 1)$. As S is locally bounded above on T, S is locally bounded above on $(-1, 1)$ as $k \cdot T$ contains $(-1, 1)$ (again by continuity of addition); so S is locally bounded above as in Prop. 9(i), and so locally bounded by Prop. 7(ii).

With this in mind, as in Prop. 8, consider $v_n \to 0$ with $S(v_n) \to a$. For each n, as $k \cdot (T/n)$ contains $(-1/n, 1/n)$, we may assume, by passing to a subsequence of v_n if necessary, that $|v_n| \leqslant 1/n$, and so $v_n = u_n^1 + ... + u_n^k$ with $u_n^i \in T/n$. Again by passing to a subsequence if necessary, by $JK_0(T)$ we may assume that $\lim_n S(u_n^i) \leqslant 0$ for $i = 1, ..., k$. By subadditivity,

$$S(v_n) \leqslant S(u_n^1) + ... + S(u_n^k),$$

so $a = \lim_n S(v_n) \leqslant 0$. Assuming that $a \neq 0$, proceed exactly as in Prop. 8 to derive a contradiction to local boundedness. So $a = 0$, i.e. $S(0+) = 0$. □

7 Sublinearity and Berz's Theorem

Theorem 2 above is reminiscent of the following classical result. Recall that for Σ closed under positve rational scaling S is *sublinear* on Σ in the sense of Berz [Ber] if S is subadditive and $S(nx) = nS(x)$ for $x \in \Sigma, n = 0, 1, 2, ...$ (i.e. S is positively $\mathbb{Q}$-homogeneous and $S(0) = 0$).

Theorem B (Berz's Theorem, [Ber]; cf. [Kuc, Th. 16.4.3])**.** *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and sublinear, then there are $c_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $S(u) = c_+u$ for $u \geqslant 0$ and $S(v) = c_-v$ for $v \leqslant 0$.*

Theorem 5 below is its category analogue, a new result. We will need the following variant of Prop 3.

Proposition 3′ (Relative linearity). *Let $G : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ be subadditive with $\Sigma \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ dense on $\mathbb{R}_+$, non-negligible Baire/measurable and closed under positive rational scaling. If G is positively $\mathbb{Q}$-homogeneous and right-continuous, then G is linear: $G(u) = c_+u$ for some $c_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $u \in \Sigma$.*

Proof. Adapt the proof of Prop. 3 above: for $0 < \delta \in \Sigma$ select *positive* rationals $q_n(\delta)$, $q_n^0(\delta)$ such that $q_n(\delta)\delta \downarrow u$ and $q_n^0(\delta)\delta \downarrow u_0$; then $q_n(\delta)/q_n^0(\delta) = q_n(\delta)\delta/q_n^0(\delta)\delta \to u/u_0$ and

$$S(q_n(\delta)\delta)/S(q_n^0(\delta)\delta) = q_n(\delta)S(\delta)/q_n^0(\delta)S(\delta) \to u/u_0. \ \square$$

Theorem 5 (Baire-Berz Theorem). *If $S : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Baire and sublinear, there are $c_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $S(u) = c_+u$ for $u \geqslant 0$ and $S(v) = c_-v$ for $v \leqslant 0$.*

Proof. By a theorem of Baire, we may choose a meagre set M such that $S|(\mathbb{R}\backslash M)$ is continuous (see [Oxt, Th. 8.1]). Expand M to be a union of closed nowhere dense sets, if necessary. Take $\Sigma := \mathbb{R}\backslash \bigcup_{q\in\mathbb{Q}} qM$, which is closed under rational scaling and is dense on $\mathbb{R}$ (by Baire's Theorem – as each $\mathbb{R}\backslash qM$ is a dense $\mathcal{G}_\delta$). In particular $\Sigma = -\Sigma$. By Prop. 3′, S is linear on $\Sigma \cap \mathbb{R}_+$. By Prop. 10, S is continuous. By Prop. 4, as S is sublinear on Σ, it is linear on $\mathbb{R}_+$; likewise $S(-x)$ is linear on $\mathbb{R}_+$. $\square$

Remark. The proof of Theorem 5 above can be dualized to yield a parallel alternative and new proof for Theorem B. Here, in place of Baire's continuity theorem, a careful use of Lusin's theorem ([Hal, §55]; cf. [BinO8, §2] for a

'near-analogue') demonstrates linearity on a subset $\Sigma \cap \mathbb{R}_+$ covering almost all of $\mathbb{R}_+$, and likewise on a subset $\Sigma \cap \mathbb{R}_-$ covering almost all of $\mathbb{R}_-$; then Props 10 and 4 complete the proof. However, an argument proving simultaneously Theorem 5 and Theorem B can be given, by appeal to density-topology arguments, for which see [BinO15]; cf. §9.9-10.

8 Quantifier weakening in regular variation

The standard work on the Karamata theory of regular variation is BGT. The present authors have returned to this area in a number of papers, together and separately, largely addressed to matters left open there. First, we address the *foundational question*: what is the appropriate generalization of the measurability and Baire property settings of BGT? Secondly, we address the *contextual question*: what, beyond the real-line setting of BGT (and other settings briefly addressed in BGT Appendix 1 such as the complex plane, Euclidean space and topological groups) is the natural context for the theory? In Theorem 6 here, we complete our reduction of the number of hard proofs in the area to zero, thus making good on a claim we have already made elsewhere (see §1). This also addresses one of the principal questions left open in BGT: why Th. 3.2.5 there – in the context of Bojanić-Karamata/de Haan Theory ([BojK], [dH]; cf. [BinO14])

$$\lim_{x\to\infty}\{f(\lambda x)-f(x)\}/g(x) = k(\lambda) \qquad (\forall \lambda > 0) \qquad (BKH)$$

– is no harder than Th. 1.4.3. there – in the context of Karamata Theory,

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} f(\lambda x)/f(x) = g(\lambda) \qquad (\forall \lambda > 0). \qquad (K)$$

Here we weaken the quantifier $\forall$ above as much as possible (cf. [BinG]). Results of this nature are false if the quantifier is weakened too much, for reasons connected with Hamel pathology (BGT § 1.1.4; cf. [Kuc, Ch. 11]). As is usual in this area, of course, one encounters a dichotomy: matters are either very nice or very nasty – even the merest hint of good behaviour being sufficient to guarantee the former; cf. [BinO7], [BinO11]. Here, the condition needed is a *one-sided* one of 'liminf liminf' type, as in the BGT results cited above, [BinG], [Hei], [Sen], or equivalently (below) of 'limsup limsup' type.

As usual for proofs, we work with Karamata theory written additively rather than multiplicatively. As in Prop. 1 above, we write

$$G(u) := \lim_{x\to\infty} F(u+x) - F(x) \qquad (\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) \qquad (K_+)$$

for the limit on the right where this exists – on all of $\mathbb{R}$ in (K_+) above, on $\mathbb{A}_F$ in Th. 6 below, etc. With F^* as above, the replacement of limits on the right in (K_+) with limsup captures the consequent asymptotic relationship in the simpler property of *subadditivity*, employed throughout the paper, and the additional key condition, needed in Theorem 6 below, is that the limsup of $F^*(u)$ as $u \downarrow 0$ is $\leqslant 0$ (thus the condition is of limsup limsup type applied to the left-hand sides of (K) and (BKH) or of limsup type applied to the right). This condition is from [BinG] (5.11) (cf. BGT Th. 3.2.5, Th. 1.4.3), following earlier work of Heiberg ([Hei] in 1971) and Seneta ([Sen] in 1973).

Theorem 6 (Quantifier-Weakening Theorem). *If*
(i)

$$\mathbb{A}_F := \{u : \lim_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)] \text{ exists and is finite}\}$$

is dense in $\mathbb{R}$*;*
(ii) F^* *satisfies the one-sided Heiberg-Seneta boundedness condition*

$$\limsup_{u\downarrow 0} F^*(u) \leqslant 0 \qquad (HS)$$

– then $\mathbb{A}_F = \mathbb{R}$ *and* F^* *is linear:* $F^*(u) = \lim_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)] = cu$ *for some* $c \in \mathbb{R}$*, and all* $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof of Theorem 6. By Prop. 1, 6 and 7, F^* is a finite, subadditive, right-continuous extension of G. So G is continuous on $\mathbb{A}_F$, and so linear by Prop. 3: $G(\sigma) = c\sigma$ for some c and all $\sigma \in \mathbb{A}_F$. As $\mathbb{A}_F$ is dense, by Prop. 5, $F^*(u) = cu$ for all u. By Prop. 1, $\mathbb{A}_F = \mathbb{R}$ and $F^*(u) = G(u)$. □

Cautionary Example. For $F := \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, one has $F(q+x) - F(x) = 0$ for all x, and so $\mathbb{A}_F$ is dense. Also $F^* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}$. Indeed, fix $t \notin \mathbb{Q}$; then $F(t+q) - F(q) = 1$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $F(t+x) - F(x) \in \{-1, 0\}$ for $x \notin \mathbb{Q}$, so that $F^*(t) = 1$ and $\mathbb{A}_F = \mathbb{Q}$. As F^* does not satisfy (lim sup), Theorem 6 does not apply, and indeed its conclusion fails. Also Theorem 2 (on linearity) – which is at the heart of Theorem 6 (via Theorem 1) – fails, as here the domain of G is $\mathbb{Q}$ and $G = 0$ with a linear extension $S = 0$ to all of $\mathbb{R}$. This shows the full force of Prop. 1(iv).

In the preceding argument Theorem 1 may be replaced by Theorem 1′ to obtain

Theorem 6′ (Strong Quantifier-Weakening Theorem). *With* F^* *and* $\mathbb{A}_F$ *as above, suppose that*

(i) $\mathbb{A}_F$ *is dense in* $\mathbb{R}$*;*
(ii) F^* *is* ***WNT**** *on* $\mathbb{A}_F$*, e.g.* F^* *satisfies* $(SS\text{-}\limsup)_0$ *or* $(BL\text{-}\limsup)_0$*. Then* $\mathbb{A}_F = \mathbb{R}$ *and* F^* *is linear:* $F^*(u) = \lim_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)] = cu$*, for some* $c \in \mathbb{R}$ *and all* $u \in \mathbb{R}$*.*

Proof. Again $\mathbb{A}_F$ is a subgroup and $G = F^*|\mathbb{A}_F$ is additive (Prop. 1); the condition $(\limsup)_0$ follows from the assumption that $(BL\text{-}\limsup)_M$ holds for some M. So F^* is **WNT*** on $\mathbb{A}_F$, by Prop. 9(i) and so Theorem $1'$ applies to $S = F^*$. □

Cautionary Example Again. Recall that for $F := \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}$ one has $F^* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\mathbb{A}_F = \mathbb{Q}$. So here $\mathbb{A}_F$ is not shift-compact, and F^*, though linear on $\mathbb{A}_F$, is not **WNT** on $\mathbb{A}_F$.

The density assumption above may be weakened by using Theorem 3 to give

Theorem 7. *With* $\mathbb{A}_F$ *as above, suppose that there exists a shift-symmetric, analytic, spanning set* $T \subseteq \mathbb{A}_F$ *such that* $F^*|T$ *is locally bounded above. Then* F^* *is linear:* $F^*(u) = \lim_{x\to\infty}[F(u+x) - F(x)] = cu$*, for some* $c \in \mathbb{R}$ *and all* $u \in \mathbb{R}$*.*

Proof. As $\mathbb{A}_F$ is a subgroup and $G = F^*|\mathbb{A}_F$ is additive (by Prop. 1), apply Theorem 3 to $S = F^*$. □

9 Complements

1. Automatic continuity. In the presence of even the merest hint of additional good behaviour, an additive function is beautifully well-behaved – it is (continuous, and hence) linear. The general context for results like this is that of *automatic continuity*, studied e.g. by us ([BinO4, 5, 6]) for real analysis, Hoffmann-Jørgensen in [Rog, Part 3, §2], [SolS] and [RosS] for groups etc. For Banach algebras and Gelfand theory see e.g. Dales [Dal2], Helson [Hel, p. 51], [DalW1], [DalW2], and the recent [KąkKL, esp. Cor. 16.7]. The pathology of discontinuity in the absence of good behaviour here is tied to set-theoretic axioms, as in §9.2 below.

An automatic continuity theorem of Hoffmann-Jørgensen is particularly relevant here for the discussion of the Baire-Berz Theorem. Hoffmann-Jørgensen proves in [Rog, Part 3: Th. 2.2.12] the (sequential) continuity

of a Baire function $f : X \to Y$ when a non-meagre group T acts on the two (Hausdorff) spaces X and Y with $f(tx) = tf(x)$, by appealing to shift-compactness (under T) of X. In the Baire-Berz Theorem it is a meagre group, namely $\mathbb{Q}_+$, that acts multiplicatively on the spaces $X = Y = \mathbb{R}$; but it is the additive structure of $\mathbb{R}$ which permits the use (in Proposition 10 above) of shift-compactness to obtain global continuity from continuity on a smaller set.

Note that the map $f(x) := x\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}}(x)$ satisfies the $\mathbb{Q}_+$-homogeneity condition $f(qx) = qf(x)$, for $q \in \mathbb{Q}_+$, and is not continuous; neither is it subadditive.

2. From Cauchy via Cantor to Woodin: axiomatics of set theory. The context of BGT, and of this paper, is as usual in analysis: ZF, augmented where necessary to ZFC by the addition of AC. This is needed, for example, in discussion of the *Hamel pathology*, as in CFE (§§1-7 above, and [Kuc]) and in regular variation (§8 above and BGT). The question now arises of replacing AC by some other axiom of set theory, for example one under which all sets are Baire/measurable, when any additive function $A : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ will automatically be continuous (via Prop. 2(i), as the level set $\{x : A(x) < n\}$ is non-negligible for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$) – see the remark after Prop. 1. The prototype here is the Axiom of Determinacy AD – see [Woo], Kechris [Kech, 38.B], and [BinO9].

In addition to the absolute result mentioned above ([KąkKL, Cor. 16.7] – in the dual of a non-distinguished Köthe echelon space), the assumption of the Continuum Hypothesis CH yields a discontinuous monomorphism from an appropriate function space $C(X)$ into a Banach algebra ([Dal 1, Th. 9.6]).

3. Hamel pathology. Despite the fact that Hamel bases provide the critical counterexamples in regular variation (Ash-Erdős-Rubel Theorem – see BGT Th.1.2.2 and §§1,2 above), the Jones-Kominek results above show that Hamel bases can be used positively – e.g., to show that a "thinning set" as above is not too thin. For further background see e.g. [Kuc, Ch. 11].

4. General context. We have restricted attention to the real line here for simplicity, but one may extend much of this to the context of normed groups, for which see [BinO7]. See also §9.8 below.

5. Generalized quantifiers. Relevant for us are weakenings of the universal quantifier, along such lines as 'for quasi all x' (i.e. for x off a negligible set) and 'there exist an infinite set', as in KBD in Prop. 9 above (§4). Mostowski [Mos] was the first in modern times to begin a study of generalized quantifiers, followed by Lindström [Lin] (for a textbook treatment see [BelS, Ch. 13]),

and most notably Barwise [Bar] – see [Vaa] for an account of this important development, and e.g. [Lap] for some recent developments in this field. Van Lambalgen [Lam] traces connections here with the conditional expectation of probability theory.

6. Sequential limits. The quantifier weakening here has been concerned with thinning as much as possible the set of λ occurring in $\lambda + x$ or λx. Related, and equally important, is the question of thinning the set of x here – that is, in letting $x \to \infty$ through not all the reals, but some thinned subset. The most familiar case is taking limits *sequentially*, as in *Kendall's theorem* (BGT, Th. 1.9.2; cf. [Bin]): for any sequence $\{x_n\}$ with $\limsup x_n = \infty$ and $\limsup x_{n+1}/x_n \to 1$ (for instance $x_n = n$), if f is smooth enough (e.g. continuous) and

$$a_n f(\lambda x_n) \to g(\lambda) \in (0, \infty) \; \forall \lambda \in I$$

for some finite interval $I \subseteq (0, \infty)$ and some sequence $a_n \to \infty$, then f is regularly varying. (Here a_n regularly varying follows from smoothness of f.) The question arises of simultaneous thinning of λ and x together. Another case here is regular variation – in many dimensions, or of measures:

$$n\mathbb{P}(a_n^{-1}\mathbf{x} \in .) \to \nu(.) \; (n \to \infty),$$

(here regular variation of $a_n \to \infty$ is assumed) and the limit (spectral) measure ν is on the unit sphere $\mathbf{S}$; see e.g. Hult et al. [Hul] for background. Now thinning is to be done on subsets of $\mathbf{S}$ on which convergence is assumed. For *convergence-determining classes* here, see e.g. Billingsley [Bil, §1.2], Landers [Lan], Rogge [Rogg]

The interplay of sequences and nets is examined in connection with amenability theory in [BinO12]. Nets of rationals directed by ascending order, termed *rational skeletons*, replace Kingman's *discrete skeletons* (integer sequences) in the passage from category to measure – see [BinO8].

7. Semigroup versus subgroup: The subgroup theorem, used in Theorem $1'$, holds if the subgroup is shift-compact. The semigroup theorem, used in Prop. $6'$, requires the semigroup to contain a non-negligible Baire or measurable subset. (Of course an analytic set spanning $\mathbb{R}_+$ over $\mathbb{Q}_+$ would do, etc.) There is a counterexample under AC in [BinO9]. Recently, sets concentrated on the rationals, so sets strongly of measure zero, which are nevertheless shift-compact are studied in [MilMO].

8. One-sided versus two-sided oscillation. In Theorem 6 (HS) may be viewed as a 'one-sided' condition in two senses: on the *range* side of $F^*(u)$ – through

the ostensible presence of only the 'limsup' (absent the 'liminf') – and equally also on the *domain* side of $F^*(u)$ – on account of '$u \downarrow 0$' limits. The former view really addresses *oscillation*: when F^* is locally bounded, the 'liminf' aspect is automatic (by Prop. 7(iii) $\liminf_{t\to 0} F^*(t) \geqslant 0$, with equality in cases of interest). On that basis, it is natural to focus on the latter, rather than the former, view in any one-sided versus two-sided analysis.

In Theorem 6, a one-sided (domain) condition at the origin corresponds to the $\mathbb{R}_+$ context (dictated by $\limsup_{x\to+\infty} [F(u+x)-F(x)]$). By contrast, the $\mathbb{R}$ context of the Berz Theorem(s) makes free use of two-sided conditions at the origin, needed for Prop. 10 (to establish continuity there).

In passing from $\mathbb{R}$ to the general normed-group context of §9.4 above, one-sided conditions are abandoned in favour of oscillations relative to full neighbourhoods (on the domain side).

9. Role of the density topology: $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}$-density. Underlying the category-measure duality between Theorem 5 and the original Berz theorem is the observation that, just as a co-meagre set is dense in the Euclidean topology $\mathcal{E}$, so also is a co-null set dense in the (Lebesgue) density topology $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}$ (because both topologies yield the Baire theorem/are Baire spaces). The latter situation is typical in view of the Lebesgue Density Theorem (cf. [Kuc, Th. 3.5.1]), together with the result that a set A has complementary inner measure zero iff $A \cap E \neq \emptyset$ for all non-null measurable E – see e.g. [Kuc, Th. 3.3.1]; one need only recall that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}$-open sets are measurable sets with all points being density points. The latter property of A is equivalent to A having full exterior measure on open intervals (i.e. $A \cap I$ has exterior measure equal to $|I|$ for all open intervals I – again see [Kuc, Th. 3.3.1]).

10. Darboux and Ostrowski. In the light of the reference to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}$ in §9.9 above, we note that Ostrowski's Theorem weakens Darboux's hypothesis of $\mathcal{E}$-local boundedness by thinning it to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}$-local boundeness (in essence, by the Lebesgue Density Theorem). The same may be said of Mehdi's Baire non-meagre hypothesis, by reverting to an appropriate category-based density topology, implicit in [BinO8], for which see [BinO15] – cf. [Wil]. (Here Banach's Category Theorem, or Localization Principle, plays the role of the density theorem – see [Ost1] for background.)

11. Ger-Kuczma classes. The Jones-Kominek work above also motivated the study by Ger and Kuczma ([Kuc, Ch. 9 and 10]) of automatic continuity, and other automatic properties, via families of "thinning" sets T appropriate to a family of functions $\mathcal{F}$ (e.g. additive or convex functions) such that for $f \in \mathcal{F}$, if the restriction function $f|T$ has a certain property, then f has a

stronger property. Compare [BinO4].

12. Bojanić-Karamata/de Haan Theory. We remarked earlier that the fact that the (BKH) case of our main result (the only surviving 'hard proof' in this theory) is no harder than the Karamata case was one of our motivations here. We invite the reader to read the proof of Th. 3.2.5 in BGT twice, once as it stands, once with 'o(1)' terms omitted and ρ set to 0. The second was our model for the proof here, so (as this differs only trivially) this extends likewise to the first. The reason for the near identity of the two proofs is that the *quantifier* being weakened appears only in the 'Karamata' aspects, even in the 'BKH' setting.

13. Beurling variation. In a companion paper [BinO13], we develop a theory of Beurling slow and regular variation, which includes both the settings of §9.12 above. Questions of quantifier weakening arise there also; we return to this elsewhere.

14. Further question. In §8 above, we work with F^*, but how do properties of F yield properties desired in F^*? For instance, if F is **WNT**, is F^* then **WNT*?** The answer is affirmative, when the supremum is just the limit (see [BinO2]).

Postscript. We take pleasure in dedicating this paper to Charles Goldie on his 70th birthday. The first author is happy to recall that the argument in [BinG] (and later in BGT) that gave rise to this paper was due to him, and was the beginning of their long and fruitful collaboration.

References

[Bar] J. Barwise, Axioms for abstract model theory, *Ann. Math. Logic* **7** (1974), 221-265

[Bec] A. Beck, *Continuous flows on the plane*, Grundl. math. Wiss. **201**, Springer, 1974.

[BelS] J. L. Bell and A. B. Slomson, Models and ultraproducts: an introduction, Springer, 1969.

[Ber] E. Berz, Sublinear functions on $\mathbb{R}$, *Aequat. Math.* **12** (1975), 200-206.

[Bern] B. C. Berndt, Ramanujan's quarterly reports. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **16** (1984), no. 5, 449–489.

[Bil] P. Billingsley, Convergence of probability measures, 2nd ed., Wiley, 1999 (1st ed. 1968).

[Bin] N. H. Bingham, Scaling and regular variation. Preprint.

[BinG] N. H. Bingham, C.M. Goldie, Extensions of regular variation. I. Uniformity and quantifiers. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **44** (1982), 473–496; Extensions of regular variation. II. Representations and indices. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **44** (1982), 497–534.
[BinGT] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie and J. L. Teugels, *Regular variation*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, 1989 (1st ed. 1987).
[BinO1] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Generic subadditive functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **136** (2008), 4257-4266.
[BinO2] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Beyond Lebesgue and Baire: generic regular variation, *Colloquium Math.* **116** (2009), 119-138.
[BinO3] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Infinite combinatorics and the foundations of regular variation, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **360** (2009), 518-529.
[BinO4] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Automatic continuity: subadditivity, convexity, uniformity, *Aequat. Math.* **78** (2009), 257-270.
[BinO5] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Infinite combinatorics in function spaces: category methods, *Publ. Inst. Math. Béograd* **86** (100) (2009), 55-73.
[BinO6] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Automatic continuity via analytic thinning, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **138** (2010), 907-919.
[BinO7] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Normed groups: Dichotomy and duality. *Dissert. Math.* **472** (2010), 138p.
[BinO8] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Kingman, category and combinatorics. *Probability and Mathematical Genetics* (Sir John Kingman Festschrift, ed. N. H. Bingham and C. M. Goldie), 135-168, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **378**, CUP, 2010.
[BinO9] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Regular variation without limits, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **370** (2010), 322-338.
[BinO10] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Beyond Lebesgue and Baire II: Bitopology and measure-category duality. *Colloquium Math.*, **121** (2010), 225-238.
[BinO11] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Dichotomy and infinite combinatorics: the theorems of Steinhaus and Ostrowski. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **150** (2011), 1-22.
[BinO12] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Steinhaus theory and regular variation: De Bruijn and after. *Indag. Math.* (N. G. de Bruijn Memorial Issue), **24** (2013), 679-692.
[BinO13] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Beurling slow and regular va-

riation, *Trans. London Math. Soc.*, to appear (see also arXiv.org/abs/1301.5894 and arXiv.org/abs/1307.5305).
[BinO14] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Cauchy's functional equation and extensions: Goldie's equation and inequality, the Gołąb-Schinzel equation and Beurling's equation, submitted.
[BinO15] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Category-measure duality and Berz's theorem, preprint.
[BinO16] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, Beyond Lebesgue and Baire: IV. Density topologies, preprint.
[BojK] R. Bojanić and J. Karamata, *On a class of functions of regular asymptotic behavior*, Math. Research Center Tech. Report 436, Madison, Wis. 1963; reprinted in *Selected papers of Jovan Karamata* (ed. V. Marić, Zevod Udžbenika, Beograd, 2009), 545-569.
[Dal1] H. G. Dales, *Automatic continuity: a survey*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **10** (1978),129-183.
[Dal2] H. G. Dales, *Banach algebras and automatic continuity*, London Math. Soc. Monographs 24, Oxford University Press, 2000.
[DalW1] H. G. Dales, and W.H. Woodin, *An introduction to independence for analysts*. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series 115, CUP, 1987.
[DalW2] H. G. Dales, and W.H. Woodin, *Super-real fields. Totally ordered fields with additional structure.* London Math. Soc. Monographs, 14. Oxford Science Publications, Oxford University Press, 1996.
[Dar] G. Darboux, Sur la composition des forces en statique, Bull. Sci. Math. **1** (9) (1875), 281-288.
[dH] L. de Haan, On regular variation and its applications to the weak convergence f sample extremes. Math. Centre Tracts 32, Amsterdam 1970.
[Hal] P. R. Halmos, *Measure Theory*, Grad. Texts in Math. 18, Springer 1974. (1st. ed. Van Nostrand, 1950).
[HarW] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, An introduction to the theory of numbers, 6th ed. Revised by D. R. Heath-Brown and J. H. Silverman (OUP 2008).
[Hei] C. H. Heiberg, A proof of a conjecture by Karamata. *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd)* (N.S.) **12** (26) (1971), 41–44.
[Hel] H. Helson, *Harmonic Analysis* (2nd ed.) Hindustan Book Agency, 1995.
[HilP] E. Hille and R. S. Phillips, Functional analysis and semi-groups, Coll. Publ. Vol 31, Amer. Math. Soc, 3rd ed. 1974 (1st ed. 1957).
[Hul] H. Hult, F. Lindskog, T. Mikosch, G. Samorodnitsky, Functional large deviations for multivariate regularly varying random walks, *Ann. Appl. Pro-*

bab. **15** (2005), 2651-2680.
[Jon] F. B. Jones, Measures and other properties of Hamel bases, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 48 (1942), 472-481.
[KąkKL] J. Kąkol, W. Kubiś, M. López-Pellicer, *Descriptive topology in selected topics of functional analysis.* Developments in Math. **24**, Springer, 2011.
[Kech] A. S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 156, Springer, 1995.
[Kom] Z. Kominek, On the continuity of $\mathbb{Q}$-convex and additive functions, *Aequat. Math.* **23** (1981), 146-150.
[Kucz] M. Kuczma, *An introduction to the theory of functional equations and inequalities. Cauchy's equation and Jensen's inequality.* 2nd ed., Birkhäuser, 2009 [1st ed. PWN, Warszawa, 1985].
[Lam] M. van Lambalgen, Conditional quantification, or Poor Man's Probability, *J. Logic Computat.* 11 (2001), 295-335.
[Lan] D. Landers, The convergence-determining class of connected open sets on product spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **33** (1972), 529-533.
[Lap] S. Lapierre, New results in the analysis of some conditional quantifiers and their logics, *Logique et Anal.* (N.S.) **34** (1991), 105-120.
[Lin] P. Lindström, First-order predicate logic with generalized quantifiers, *Theoria* **32** (1966), 186-195
[Meh] M. R. Mehdi, On convex functions, *J. London Math. Soc.* **39** (1964), 321-328.
[MilO] H. I. Miller and A. J. Ostaszewski, Group actions and shift-compactness. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **392** (2012), 23-39.
[MilMO] H. I. Miller, L. Miller, A. J. Ostaszewski, Singular sets with shift-compactness properties, Preprint.
[Mos] A. Mostowski, On a generalization of quantifiers, *Fund. Math.* **44** (1957), 12-36.
[Ost1] A. J. Ostaszewski, Analytically heavy spaces: Analytic Cantor and Analytic Baire Theorems, *Topology and its Applications*, 158 (2011), 253-275.
[Ost2] A. J. Ostaszewski, Beyond Lebesgue and Baire III: Steinhaus' Theorem and its descendants, *Topology and its App.* **160** (2013), 1144-1154.
[Ostr] A. Ostrowski, Mathematische Miszellen XIV: Über die Funktionalgleichung der Exponentialfunktion und verwandte Funktionalgleichungen, *Jahresb. Deutsch. Math. Ver.* 38 (1929) 54-62, reprinted in *Collected papers of Alexander Ostrowski*, Vol. 4, 49-57, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1984.

[Oxt] J. C. Oxtoby: *Measure and category*, 2nd ed. Graduate Texts in Math. **2**, Springer, 1980.
[Rog] C. A. Rogers, J. Jayne, C. Dellacherie, F. Topsøe, J. Hoffmann-Jørgensen, D. A. Martin, A. S. Kechris, A. H. Stone, *Analytic sets*. Academic Press, 1980.
[Rogg] L. Rogge, The convergence-determining class of regular open sets. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **37** (1973), 581-585.
[RosS] C. Rosendal, S. Solecki, Automatic continuity of homomorphisms and fixed points on metric compacta, *Israel J. Math.* **162** (2007), 349–371.
[Sen] E. Seneta, An interpretation of some aspects of Karamata's theory of regular variation. *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd)* (N.S.) **15** (29) (1973), 111–119.
[SolS] S. Solecki and S. M. Srivastava, Automatic continuity of group operations, *Topology Appl.* **77** (1997), 65-75.
[Vaa] J. Väänänen, Barwise: Abstract model theory and generalized quantifiers, *Bull. Symb. Logic* **10** (2004), 37-53.
[Wil] W. Wilczyński, *Density topologies*, Handbook of measure theory, Vol. I, II, 675–702, North-Holland, 2002.
[Woo] W. H. Woodin, *The axiom of determinacy, forcing axioms, and the nonstationary ideal*. 2nd ed., de Gruyter, 2010.

Mathematics Department, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ; n.bingham@ic.ac.uk
Mathematics Department, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE; A.J.Ostaszewski@lse.ac.uk